

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

<b>Title:</b> "System and Method for Dynamically Adapting a Banner Advertisement to the Content of a Web Page"	
<b>Appellant(s):</b> Reiner Kraft et al.	
<b>Attorney Docket No.:</b> ARC9-2000-0100-US1	
<b>Serial No.:</b> 09/617,455	<b>Examiner:</b> James W. Myhre
<b>Filed:</b> 07/17/2000	<b>Art Unit:</b> 3622

---

Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

**REPLY BRIEF**

Dear Sir:

This Reply Brief is submitted in response to the Examiner's Answer of March 8, 2006. Appellants will reproduce the various sections of the Appeal Brief in order to consolidate the arguments in a single integral document, and in order to facilitate the examination of the claims currently on file.

**Table of Contents**

<u>Section</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
(1)	Real Party in Interest	2
(2)	Related Appeals and Interferences	2
(3)	Status of Claims	2
(4)	Status of Amendments	2
(5)	Summary of Claimed Subject Matter	2
(6)	Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal	8
(7)	Arguments	9
App. A	Claims Appendix	17

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

The real party in interest is International Business Machines Corporation.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

No other appeals or interferences exist that relate to the present application or appeal.

**(3) Status of Claims**

Claims 1, 2, 17, and 22 have been canceled without prejudice, and claims 3, 18, and 23 have been amended to include all the limitations and elements of their respective parent claims, without adding any new matter.

Claims 3-16, 18-21, and 23-26 are pending, and remain in the application. In the Examiner's Answer, the claims were indicated to be rejected as follows:

- Claims 1-3, 17, 18, 22, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kurtzman II et al. (6,144,944).
- Claims 4-16, 19-21, and 24-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurtzman II et al (6,144,944).

**(4) Status of Amendments**

No amendments are outstanding.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The present invention relates in general to a software system and associated method for use in e-commerce advertising with a search engine over a network. More specifically, this invention pertains to a

computer software product for **dynamically adapting a banner advertisement to the categorization, surrounding page content, and changes of the advertiser's repository**. *Reference is made to Page 1, lines 6 - 13.*

#### 5.1. Problems addressed by the present invention

Prior to presenting substantive arguments in favor of the allowability of the claims on file, it might be desirable to summarize the present invention in view of the problems it addresses. In general, banner ads can have text, still or moving graphics, or multimedia messages, and typically serve as hypertext links, such that the user is linked to other specified pages if the user clicks on the banner ads. Banner ads can be categorized as corporate image ads, and information ads.

The purpose of corporate image ads is to enhance the visibility and public image of a business enterprise, and to reflect its presence, participation and involvement in a particular domain. It is therefore crucial to prevent the misplacement of ads that disadvantageously affect the public image of an enterprise.

The information banner ads highlight a specific product, service, or content, and provide a URL to corresponding content information pages. The context placement of these banner ads is critical in that it needs to match the interests of potential customers. Currently, advertisers are able to select the surrounding content of the banner ads based primarily on the content categories.

For example, a developer portal wishes to advertise on a search service provider such as Yahoo!® in order to gain more traffic. Search service providers offer a variety of categories where to place product or content ads. As an illustration, "software development", "Java®", "XML", etc. might constitute reasonable categories for an ad placement for the developer portal. **To place the same ad within a "Home & Garden" category would be a misplacement**, since the percentage of potential customers who are simultaneously seeking home and garden products and a software development product is not high.

Such misplacement is a common occurrence due in part to the static nature of the banner ad. As products and services of a company continue to change, it would be advantageous to have the banner ads automatically reflect these changes. As an example, for a data store carrying a variety of products and services, it would be desirable to have the newer or top rated products and services within specific categories automatically updated and displayed in the banner ads. Prior to the advent of the present invention, the most viable approach was for the advertiser to manually update the banner ads to reflect the desired products and services.

Such a "static approach" presents several disadvantages, among which are the following:

a) the selection might become obsolete after a short period of time; and

b) the maintenance effort to administer and manage the banner ads will be too high to support over an extended period of time. In particular, the problem of maintaining the banner ads content up to date becomes

increasingly difficult for companies that provide a variety of different products and multimedia information within a repository that continuously changes over a short time interval. Reference is made to page 1, line 15 through page 6, line 21.

## 5.2. Summary of the subject matter of independent claim 3

The adaptive advertising system 10 (FIGS. 1, 2, and 3) of the present invention **dynamically adapts the content of a banner ad 160 to the categorization, surrounding page content, and changes of the advertiser's repository of products and services.** In addition, the adaptive advertising system 10 provides appropriate information resources based on the user's needs.

As a result, the adaptive advertising system 10 provides the capability to serve advertisements with adaptive contents. This level of adaptivity ensures that the content of the banner advertisement reflects the current content of the web page where it is embedded, with a high degree of confidence. Advertisers using advertisements with adaptive content are relieved from the tedious and time and resource consuming task of having to repeatedly create new advertisements that are specifically designed for different page contents. The adaptive advertising system 10 will automatically adapt the advertisement to the continuously changing page content. *Reference is made to page 7, lines 20 - 22.*

Based on the page content, the adaptive advertising system 10 determines the desirability to display the banner advertisement 160. *Reference is made to page 16, lines 3 - 9.* If the content is inappropriate, the adaptive advertising system might decide not to display the banner

advertisement to avoid an undesirable association between the banner advertisement and the page content. *Reference is made to page 16, lines 11 - 15.* **As an illustration**, consider an IBM advertisement within the "comp.programming" category being displayed next to an article with an obscene content. IBM's corporate image might not be well served with such an undesirable association. The adaptive advertising system identifies this scenario, and disables itself, i.e., prevents the display of the banner ad, to avoid such a negative image association.

Therefore, the adaptive advertising system either displays or suppresses the banner ad based on the surrounding page content. This involves taking any one or more of the following steps:

- a) Fine tuning the advertisement by showing the advertisement in the proper specialized category.
- b) Replacing the category content.
- c) The adaptive advertising system disables the advertisement until such time as the page content changes.

**Transparently to the user, the system 10 continuously operates in the background to adapt banner advertisements based on the page content, surrounding content, and specific categorization or keywords provided by a domain specific repository. The system 10 is generally comprised of a banner display module 200, a keyword analyzer 210, an ad proxy router 212, an ad server 214, a banner advertising manager 220, an ad search engine 230, an indexer 252, an ad repository 240, an ad index repository 242, an advertiser site repository 244, and optionally a domain specific dictionary / repository 250.** *Reference is made to page 15, line 20 through page 16, line 8.*

The keyword analyzer 210 analyzes the page content, and the banner display module 200 determines the desirability of associating the advertisement with the page. If the banner display module 200 determines that such an association does not adversely impact the advertiser's image, the banner display module 200 selectively displays the advertisement. Otherwise, the banner display module 200 suppresses the advertisement. *Reference is made to page 16, lines 10 - 24.*

**The banner display module 200 sends a data stream** containing the following information to the proxy router 212: the selected category; the keyword from the page; and the address of the ad server. In turn, the ad proxy router 212 sends the following information to the ad server 214: the session information; the selected category; and the keywords from the page.

The indexer 252 indexes the content of the advertiser's site, and stores the generated hyperlinks in the ad index repository. The ad repository stores the following: various advertisements from the advertiser; multimedia files; and executable codes or applications. *Reference is made to pages 17 and 18 and FIG. 4.*

In one embodiment, the advertisement includes a static portion such as the advertiser's logo, and a dynamic portion. The dynamic portion can be any one or more of: multimedia files; advertisements, executable codes, or hypertext links.

### 5.3. Summary of the subject matter of independent claim 18

While claim 3 exemplifies the present invention in connection with a system for dynamically adapting an advertisement based on a content of a page, claim 18 generally corresponds to claim 3, and exemplifies the present invention in connection with a computer program product for dynamically adapting an advertisement based on a content of a page.

### 5.4. Summary of the subject matter of independent claim 23

While claim 3 exemplifies the present invention in connection with a system for dynamically adapting an advertisement based on a content of a page, claim 23 generally corresponds to claim 3, and exemplifies the present invention in connection with a method for dynamically adapting an advertisement based on a content of a page.

## **(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

Appellant respectfully traverses the following grounds of rejection and request that they be reviewed on appeal:

### 6.1. First Ground of Rejection

- Claims 1-3, 17, 18, 22, and 23 stand rejected as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. 102, by Kurtzman II et al (6,144,944), hereinafter "Kurtzman".

### 6.2. Second Ground of Rejection

- Claims 4-16, 19-21, and 24-26 stand rejected as being obvious in view of Kurtzman II et al (6,144,944).



## **(7) Arguments**

### **7.A. Argument Responding to the First Ground of Rejection**

Claims 1-3, 17, 18, 22, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kurtzman II et al (6,144,944), reasoning as follows:

“Claims 1, 17, and 22: Kurtzman discloses a system, method and program for adapting an advertisement based on the content of a page, comprising:

- a. analyzing the page content (col 4, lines 50-57);
- b. determining the desirability of the advertisement with the page (col 4, lines 32-34); and
- c. displaying at least a portion of the desirable advertisement (col 5, lines 44-50).

Claims 2, 3, 18, and 23: Kurtzman discloses a system, method, and program for adapting an advertisement based on the content of a page as in Claims 1, 17, and 22 above, and further discloses not displaying inappropriate advertisements (col 23, lines 48-49) and displaying a first portion of the advertisement pending retrieval of a second portion of the advertisement (col 7, lines 32-39).”

Appellants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that the rejected claims are not anticipated by Kurtzman. In support of this position, Appellants submit the following arguments.

#### **(a). Legal Standard for Lack of Novelty (Anticipation)**

The standard for lack of novelty, that is, for "anticipation," is one of strict identity. To anticipate a claim for a patent, a **single prior source must contain** all its essential elements, and the burden of proving such anticipation is on the party making such assertion of anticipation.

Anticipation cannot be shown by combining more than one reference to show the elements of the claimed invention. The amount of newness and usefulness need only be minuscule to avoid a finding of lack of novelty.

The following are two court opinions in support of Appellants' position of non anticipation, with emphasis added for clarity purposes:

- "Anticipation under Section 102 can be found only if a reference shows **exactly** what is claimed; where there are **differences** between the reference disclosures and the claim, a rejection must be based on obviousness under Section 103." *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 227 USPQ 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985).
- "**Absence** from a cited reference **of any element** of a claim of a patent negates anticipation of that claim by the reference." *Kloster Speedsteel AB v. Crucible Inc.*, 793 F.2d 1565, 230 USPQ 81 (Fed. Cir. 1986), on rehearing, 231 USPQ 160 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

**(b). Application of the Anticipation Standard**

The Examiner refers to column 4, lines 32-34 of Kurtzman, which excerpt is reproduced below with emphasis added:

"The affinity of an attribute to an object is determined by comparing the attribute to an affinity criterion associated with the object. For instance, a **user's** demographic attribute would be compared to an advertisement's demographic criterion in order to measure the demographic affinity **of the user** to the advertisement."

In rejecting claim 3 (corresponding to amended claim 1), **the Examiner** simply provided reference to the lack of display of an inappropriate advertisement, but **did not ascertain whether or not the inappropriateness of the page content relates to the user or the advertiser's image, as recited in claim 3.** Appellants respectfully submit that Kurtzman's ad server 100 assesses the appropriateness of the

advertisement relative to the fitness to the user, as clarified in the excerpt below:

**“The ad server 100, including the ad exec program 101, in combination with the affinity framework 110, provides a flexible and efficient system for selecting the best-fit advertisement to show a user at the client 175.** In other embodiments, the ad server 100 can also be used in other types of applications other than advertising. For example, the ad server 100 can be used for job banks and educational applications, where dynamically generated information is being displayed. The ad selection is based partially on matching psychographic, demographic, geographic, sociographic, and other information about the individual to a set of possible advertisements. The ad server 100 also allows ad selection to be constrained by characteristics external to the individual, such as ad impression limits and advertisement priorities based on revenue optimization.”  
*Reference is made to column 2, line 57 - column 3, line 4.*

Appellants respectfully submit that the foregoing excerpt clarifies that **Kurtzman is not concerned with the advertiser’s image**, but rather with the user’s need. Based on the strict standard of anticipation, independent claim 3 and the claims dependent thereon are not anticipated by Kurtzman. Independent claims 18 and 23 are also allowable for generally reciting the novel subject matter of claim 1, and thus claims 18 and 23 and the claims dependent thereon are allowable.

#### **7.B. Argument Responding to the Second Ground of Rejection**

Claims 4-16, 19-21, and 24-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurtzman II et al (6,144,944). Appellants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit the following supporting arguments.

### **(a). Legal Standard for Obviousness**

The following legal authorities set the general legal standards in support of Appellants position of non obviousness, with emphasis added for added clarity:

- MPEP 706.02(j), **"To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met.** First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, **the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.** The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991) ... The initial burden is on the examiner to provide some **suggestion of the desirability** of doing what the inventor has done. "To support the conclusion that the claimed invention is directed to obvious subject matter, either the **references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention** or the examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references." Ex parte Clapp, 227 USPQ 972, 973 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985)."
- **In determining the differences between the prior art and the claims, the question under 35 U.S.C. 103 is** not whether the differences themselves would have been obvious, but **whether the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious.** The prior art perceived a need for mechanisms to dampen resonance, whereas the inventor eliminated the need for dampening via the one-piece gapless support structure. "Because that insight was contrary to the understandings and expectations of the art, the structure effectuating it would not have been obvious to those skilled in the art." 713 F.2d at 785, 218 USPQ at 700 (citations omitted).
- MPEP §2143.03, "All Claim Limitations Must Be Taught or Suggested: To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, **all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.** In re Royka, 490

F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). "**All words in a claim must be considered** in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)."

- MPEP §2143.01, "The Prior Art Must Suggest The Desirability Of The Claimed Invention: There are three possible sources for a motivation to combine references: the nature of the problem to be solved, the teachings of the prior art, and the knowledge of persons of ordinary skill in the art." *In re Rouffet*, 149 F.3d 1350, 1357, 47 USPQ2d 1453, 1457-58 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (**The combination of the references taught every element of the claimed invention, however without a motivation to combine, a rejection based on a prima facie case of obvious was held improper.**). The level of skill in the art cannot be relied upon to provide the suggestion to combine references. *Al-Site Corp. v. VSI Int'l Inc.*, 174 F.3d 1308, 50 USPQ2d 1161 (Fed. Cir. 1999).
- "**Obviousness cannot be established** by combining the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention, **absent some teaching or suggestion** supporting the combination." *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d at 1075, 5 USPQ2d at 1598 (citing *ACS Hosp. Sys. v. Montefiore Hosp.*, 732 F.2d 1572, 1577, 221 USPQ 929, 933 (Fed. Cir. 1984)). **What a reference teaches** and whether it teaches toward or **away from the claimed invention** are questions of fact. See *Raytheon Co. v. Roper Corp.*, 724 F.2d 951, 960-61, 220 USPQ 592, 599-600 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 835, 83 L. Ed. 2d 69, 105 S. Ct. 127 (1984). "
- "When a rejection depends on a combination of prior art references, there must be **some teaching, suggestion, or motivation** to combine the references. See *In re Geiger*, 815 F.2d 686, 688, 2 USPQ2d 1276, 1278 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "**Obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation** to do so found either explicitly or implicitly in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See MPEP 2143.01; *In re Kotzab*, 217 F.3d 1365, 1370, 55 USPQ2d 1313, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

- “With respect to core factual findings in a determination of patentability, however, the **Board cannot simply reach conclusions based on its own understanding or experience** -- or on its assessment of what would be basic knowledge or common sense. **Rather, the Board must point to some concrete evidence in the record** in support of these findings.” See *In re Zurko*, 258 F.3d 1379 (Fed. Cir. 2001).
- “We have noted that **evidence of a suggestion, teaching, or motivation to combine** may flow from the prior art references themselves, the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, or, in some cases, from the nature of the problem to be solved, see *Pro-Mold & Tool Co. v. Great Lakes Plastics, Inc.*, 75 F.3d 1568, 1573, 37 USPQ2d 1626, 1630 (Fed. Cir. 1996), *Para-Ordinance Mfg. v. SGS Imports Intern., Inc.*, 73 F.3d 1085, 1088, 37 USPQ2d 1237, 1240 (Fed. Cir. 1995), although “the suggestion more often comes from the teachings of the pertinent references,” *Rouffet*, 149 F.3d at 1355, 47 USPQ2d at 1456. The range of sources available, however, does not diminish the requirement for actual evidence. That is, **the showing must be clear and particular**. See, e.g., *C.R. Bard*, 157 F.3d at 1352, 48 USPQ2d at 1232. **Broad conclusory statements regarding the teaching of multiple references, standing alone, are not “evidence.”** E.g., *McElmurry v. Arkansas Power & Light Co.*, 995 F.2d 1576, 1578, 27 USPQ2d 1129, 1131 (Fed. Cir. 1993) (“Mere denials and conclusory statements, however, are not sufficient to establish a genuine issue of material fact.”); *In re Sichert*, 566 F.2d 1154, 1164, 196 USPQ 209, 217 (CCPA 1977).” See *In re Dembiczak*, 175 F. 3d 994 (Fed. Cir. 1999).
- “To prevent the use of hindsight based on the invention to defeat patentability of the invention, **this court requires the examiner to show a motivation to combine the references** that create the case of obviousness. In other words, **the examiner must show reasons** that the skilled artisan, confronted with the same problems as the inventor and with no knowledge of the claimed invention, would select the elements from the cited prior art references **for combination in the manner claimed**.” See *In re Rouffet*, 149, F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 1998).
- The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious **unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination**. *In re Mills*, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Although a prior art device “may be capable of being modified to run the way the apparatus is claimed, **there must be a suggestion or motivation in the reference** to do so.” 916

F.2d at 682, 16 USPQ2d at 1432.). See also In re Fritch, 972 F.2d 1260, 23 USPQ2d 1780 (Fed. Cir. 1992) (flexible landscape edging device which is conformable to a ground surface of varying slope not suggested by combination of prior art references).

- If the **proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory** for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification. In re Gordon, 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

**(b). Application of the Obviousness Standard**

The Examiner presented the following ground in support of the obviousness rejection, with emphasis added:

“Claims 4-7, 19, and 24: ... However, **Kurtzman does not explicitly disclose that the first portion of the advertisement is a static portion which includes an advertiser's logo.** Official Notice is taken that it is old and well known within the marketing arts to disclose static symbols or text (such as "Downloading") to a user while a file is being downloaded through a network. It is also well known for a company or advertiser to display its logo, such as has been done by network television stations displaying their call sign and logo during periods of non-reception or outages. ... One would have been motivated to display such a static logo while waiting for the rest of the advertisement to download in order to prevent the user being presented with a "blank" screen during the wait time.”

In responding to the Appellants' arguments, the Examiner further relied on Landsman, U.S. Patent No. 6,314,451.

Appellants respectfully incorporate the arguments presented earlier in support of the allowance of representative claim 3 over Kurtzman, and further submit that the Examiner has overlooked that the advertisement and more specifically the first portion of the advertisement is displayed only

if the advertisement does not disadvantageously affect the advertiser's image.

Such a conditional display of the first portion of the advertisement is recited in the claims and should not be disregarded. Furthermore, neither reference cited by the Examiner, discloses this conditional display of the advertisement, whether considered independently or in combination with each other.

Consequently, the claims 4-16, 19-21, and 24-26 are not obvious in view of the cited references.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 8, 2006  
Samuel A. Kassatly Law Office  
20690 View Oaks Way  
San Jose, CA 95120  
Tel.: (408) 323-5111  
Fax: (408) 521-0111



---

Samuel A. Kassatly  
Attorney for Appellants  
Reg. No. 32,247



**APPENDIX A**  
**CLAIMS ON APPEAL**

1 - 2. (Canceled)

3. (Currently amended) A system for dynamically adapting an advertisement based on a content of a page, comprising:  
a keyword analyzer for analyzing the page content;  
a banner display module for determining a desirability of associating the advertisement with the page;  
the banner display module selectively displaying at least a portion of the advertisement if an association between the advertisement and the page is determined to be desirable;  
wherein if the banner display module determines the association to be inappropriate relative to the page content, the banner display module suppresses the advertisement; and  
~~The system according to claim 2, wherein if the banner display module determines that the advertisement can be displayed without disadvantageously affecting an advertiser's image, the banner display module displays a first portion of the advertisement, pending a retrieval of a second portion of the advertisement.~~

4. The system according to claim 3, wherein the first portion of the advertisement is a static portion.

5. The system according to claim 4, wherein the second portion of the advertisement is a dynamic portion.

6. The system according to claim 4, wherein the static portion includes an advertiser's logo.

7. The system according to claim 5, wherein the dynamic portion is any one or more of: a multimedia file; an advertisement, an executable code, or a hypertext link.

8. The system according to claim 7, further including an ad server that serves an advertiser's site; and  
wherein the ad server has an address.

9. The system according to claim 7, wherein the keyword analyzer specifies a selected category for the advertisement based on the page content.

10. The system according to claim 9, further including an ad proxy router; and  
wherein the banner display module sends a data stream containing the following information to the proxy router:  
the selected category;  
at least one keyword from the page; and  
the address of the ad server.

11. The system according to claim 10, wherein the ad proxy router sends the following information to the ad server:  
session information;  
the selected category; and  
the at least one keyword from the page.

12. The system according to claim 8, wherein the advertiser's site includes a banner advertising manager.

13. The system according to claim 12, wherein the advertiser's site further includes an indexer for indexing the content of the advertiser's site, and for generating a plurality of hyperlinks therefrom; and  
an ad index repository for storing the hyperlinks.

14. The system according to claim 13, wherein the advertiser's site further includes an ad repository for storing any one or more of the following:

- an advertisement;
- a multimedia file; or
- an executable code.

15. The system according to claim 9, wherein the page is classified under a current category; and

wherein the banner display module compares the current category and the selected category, and selects either the current category or the selected category.

16. The system according to claim 15, further including a domain specific dictionary for refining the selected category.

17. (Canceled)

18. (Currently amended) A computer program product for dynamically adapting an advertisement based on a content of a page, comprising:  
a keyword analyzer for analyzing the page content;  
a banner display module for determining a desirability of associating the advertisement with the page;  
the banner display module selectively displaying at least a portion of the advertisement if an association between the advertisement and the page is determined to be desirable;

The computer program product according to claim 17, wherein if the banner display module determines the association to be inappropriate relative to the page content, the banner display module suppresses the advertisement; and

wherein if the banner display module determines that the advertisement can be displayed without disadvantageously affecting an advertiser's image, the banner display module displays a first portion of the advertisement, pending a retrieval of a second portion of the advertisement.

19. The computer program product according to claim 18, wherein the first portion of the advertisement is a static portion;

wherein the static portion includes an advertiser's logo;

wherein the second portion of the advertisement is a dynamic portion;

and

wherein the dynamic portion is any one or more of: a multimedia file; an advertisement, an executable code, or a hypertext link.

20. The computer program product according to claim 19, further including an ad server that serves an advertiser's site;

wherein the ad server has an address; and  
wherein the keyword analyzer specifies a selected category for the advertisement based on the page content.

21. The computer program product according to claim 20, further including an ad proxy router;  
wherein the banner display module sends a data stream containing the following information to the proxy router:

the selected category;  
at least one keyword from the page; and  
an address of the ad server; and

wherein the ad proxy router sends the following information to the ad server:

session information;  
the selected category; and  
the at least one keyword from the page.

22. (Canceled)

23. (Currently amended) A method for dynamically adapting an advertisement based on a content of a page, comprising:  
a keyword analyzer for analyzing the page content;  
a banner display module for determining a desirability of associating the advertisement with the page;  
the banner display module selectively displaying at least a portion of the advertisement if an association between the advertisement and the page is determined to be desirable;

~~The method according to claim 22~~, wherein if the association of the advertisement is determined to be inappropriate relative to the page content, the banner display module suppressing the advertisement; and  
if the association of the advertisement is determined to be appropriate relative to the page content, the banner display module displaying a first portion of the advertisement, pending a retrieval of a second portion of the advertisement.

24. The method according to claim 23, further including displaying the second portion;

wherein the first portion of the advertisement is a static portion;

wherein the static portion includes an advertiser's logo;

wherein the second portion of the advertisement is a dynamic portion;

and

wherein the dynamic portion is any one or more of: a multimedia file; an advertisement, an executable code, or a hypertext link.

25. The method according to claim 24, further including the keyword analyzer specifying a selected category for the advertisement based on the page content.

26. The method according to claim 25, further including the banner display module sending a data stream containing the following information to a proxy router:

the selected category;

at least one keyword from the page; and

an address of an ad server; and

wherein the ad proxy router sends the following information to the ad server:

- session information;

- the selected category; and

- the at least one keyword from the page.